

REMARKS

Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Moreover, the applicants have reviewed the First (Non-Final) Office Action of May 18, 2004, and submit that this paper is responsive to all points raised therein.

Claims 9 and 12 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 are new, and dependent on claim 12. Claims 16-22 are new.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Weber (U.S. Patent No. 3,670,413).

Claims 9 and 12 have been further amended to recite that the respective ends or second portions of the flexible members are configured such that downward pressure on these ends or second portions, respectively, causes the engaging portions and first portions, respectively, to move outward. This outward movement, for example, allows the receiver, and hence, the blades to be releasable from the stub, or other rotating member.

Weber teaches spring clips 13 with ends that are moved outward to release the blade 12 from the hub 14. This outward movement of the ends of the spring clips 13 is in no way the downward movement of the ends or second portions, that results in the engaging portions or first portions, respectively, moving outward, allowing the blades to be releasable, as recited in claims 9 and 12.

Based on the above, Weber does not show the structure recited in claims 9 and 12. Accordingly, claims 9 and 12 are not anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b).

Moreover, since the flexible members of claims 9 and 12 operate in a completely different manner than the spring clips 13 of Weber, it is respectfully asserted that Weber can not render claims 9 and 12 obvious under 35 USC 103(a).

Since claims 9 and 12 are neither anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b), nor obvious in view of Weber under 35 USC 103(a), claims 10 and 11, and 13-15, respectively dependent thereon, are also allowable over this cited art for the same reasons. These claims further distinguish the invention from this cited art.

New claims 16-22 have been added. Claim 16 includes the language discussed above for claim 12. Based on the discussion above, it is respectfully asserted that claim 16 is neither anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Weber nor obvious under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Weber.

Since claim 16 is neither anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b), nor obvious in view of Weber under 35 USC 103(a), claims 17 and 18, dependent thereon, are also allowable over this cited art for the same reasons. These claims further distinguish the invention from this cited art.

Claim 19 is directed to a lawnmower blade including a receiver with flexible members having oppositely disposed first and second ends. The flexible members include first portions at the first ends, that are configured for moving between outward and inward positions, and second portions at the second ends, that are configured such that pressure thereon moves the first portions to the outward positions.

Weber, as cited in the Office Action of May 18, 2004, at page 4, shows the spring clips 13 having structure cited as the first and second portions at the same end of the spring clip. This is in contrast to the claimed structure, where the first and second portions of the flexible members are at different ends of the flexible members.

Based on the discussion above, the claimed structure is not shown nor obvious in view of Weber. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that claim 19 is neither anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Weber nor obvious under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Weber.

Since claim 19 is neither anticipated by Weber under 35 USC 102(b), nor obvious in view of Weber under 35 USC 103(a), claims 20-22, dependent thereon, are also allowable over this cited art for the same reasons. These claims further distinguish the invention from this cited art.

Finally, the correspondence address for the undersigned attorney should be changed to indicate the correspondence address below. The above described Office Action arrived at the office of the undersigned with numerous inaccuracies, including an incorrect law firm name, city and zip code.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Allowance of all pending claims, 9-22, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI SHALTON WELTE SUELTHAUS PC

Date: August 18, 2004

By: 
Jerome R. Smith, Jr., Reg. No. 35,684
700 West 47th Street, Ste. 1000
Kansas City, MO 64112
Tel: (816) 360-4119
Fax: (816) 753-1536
Attorney for Applicants